PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ENERGY DIVISION

ID #11452
RESOLUTION E-4518
August 2, 2012

R E S O L U T I O N

RESOLUTION E-4518: Certification of Marin Energy Authority's 2012 Energy Efficiency Program Administration Plan pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(f).

PROPOSED OUTCOME: This Resolution certifies Marin Energy Authority's 2012 Energy Efficiency Program Administration Plan, submitted pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(e) and (f), and orders Pacific Gas & Electric Company to transfer up to $428,270 in funds collected from Marin Energy Authority customers through nonbypassable charges authorized by the commission for cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation programs.

ESTIMATED COST: $0 incremental cost to PG&E ratepayers

SUMMARY

Senate Bill (SB) 790 (Leno, 2011) modified Public Utilities Code Section 381.1,[1] giving CCAs the option to "elect" to become an administrator for cost-effective energy efficiency (EE) and conservation programs, subject to Commission certification of a plan approved by the CCA's governing board. Pursuant to that section, Marin Energy Authority (MEA) submitted a 2012 Energy Efficiency Program Plan ("MEA plan") requesting $428,270 to administer programs for their customers.

[1] Henceforth, all code references are to the Public Utilities Code.

This resolution certifies MEA's plan according to the criteria set forth in Section 381.1(f) (1)-(6). The implementation process we utilize here is on an interim basis without prejudice to any future Commission decision-making on implementation of SB 790. PG&E is ordered to transfer to MEA all eligible monies collected from MEA customers, after subtracting amounts dedicated to statewide and regional programs, not to exceed $428,270, for purposes of executing the MEA plan.[2]

BACKGROUND

Assembly Bill (AB) 117 added Sections 331.1, 366.2, and 381.1 to the Public Utilities Code, enabling cities and/or counties to implement a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) program. The CCA program allows communities to offer procurement service to electric customers within their political boundaries.

Senate Bill (SB) 790 (Leno, 2011) modified Section 381.1, adding subsections (e) and (f), which give CCA's the option to "elect" to become an administrator for cost-effective Energy Efficiency (EE) and conservation programs, subject to Commission certification of a plan approved by the CCA's governing board.

Section 381.1(e) states:

> "The impartial process established by the commission shall allow a registered community choice aggregator to elect to become the administrator of funds collected from the aggregator's electric service customers and collected through a nonbypassable charge authorized by the commission, for cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation programs, ***except those funds collected for broader statewide and regional programs authorized by the commission***." (Emphasis added)

Section 381.1(f)(1)-(6) states:

[2] Procedures for how CCAs may be able to apply for EE program funding for 2012 and 2013-2014 have been promulgated via an ALJ Ruling, dated June 20, 2012, in the R.09-11-014 docket, linked here: http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/efile/RULINGS/169213.pdf. Comments are sought from parties by August 2012 on the proposals set forth in the ruling.

> "A community choice aggregator electing to become an administrator shall submit a plan, approved by its governing board, to the commission for the administration of cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation programs for the aggregator's electric service customers that includes funding requirements, a program description, a cost-effectiveness analysis, and the duration of the program. The commission shall certify that the plan submitted does all of the following:
>
> (1) Is consistent with the goals of the programs established pursuant to this section and Section 399.4.
>
> (2) Advances the public interest in maximizing cost-effective electricity savings and related benefits.
>
> (3) Accommodates the need for broader statewide or regional programs.
>
> (4) Includes audit and reporting requirements consistent with the audit and reporting requirements established by the commission pursuant to this section.
>
> (5) Includes evaluation, measurement, and verification protocols established by the community choice aggregator.
>
> (6) Includes performance metrics regarding the community choice aggregator's achievement of the objectives listed in paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, and in any previous plan."

On February 3, 2012, MEA submitted a plan to the Energy Division requesting to administer energy efficiency program funding for the 2012-2015 timeframe under P.U. Code Section 381.1. MEA's original funding request appeared to be based on an assumption that CCAs could seek to administer funds under *both* Sections

381.1(a)[3] and 381.1(e) and (f)[4] via the "certification" process afforded under 381.1(e) and (f) only. The original plan was for 2012-2015 and envisioned providing energy efficiency services to customers throughout Marin County, including those customers not served by MEA who are currently customers of PG&E. Energy Division performed a cursory review of MEA's original plan and determined that modifications would be needed in order to effectively respond within the statutory framework and current IOU energy efficiency budget cycles.

After consulting with the Commission's Energy Division, MEA mailed a letter addressed to the Commission's Energy Division Director, dated June 5, 2012, clarifying that they wished to revise their request to seek funding only under the Section 381.1(e) and (f) certification process. After further consultation with Commission staff, MEA amended its plan to seek funding for 2012 only, in order to coincide with the conclusion of the 2010-2012 IOU energy efficiency budget cycle. MEA also amended its plan to address several deficiencies identified by Commission staff.

On June 20, 2012, ALJ Fitch issued a ruling in R.09-11-014 regarding procedures for CCAs to become administrators of EE programs through the Section 381.1(a) application process and through the Section 381.1 (e) and (f) certification process. The ruling requested comments from parties to refresh the record on the subject of how CCAs will be able to participate in administering energy efficiency programs on behalf of the customers and/or geographic areas they serve. In the meantime, the ruling directed CCAs on how to make such requests "while the permanent procedures for program cycles beginning in 2015 are under consideration and finalized by the Commission."[5]

On June 22, 2012, MEA submitted an amended plan, approved by its governing board on June 20, 2012, to the Energy Division Director and served it on the R.09-

---

[3] Section 381.1(a) enables a CCA to apply to administer a potentially larger pool of funds, including for programs delivered to non-CCA customers and for statewide and regional programs. However, the approval of such a program proposal is discretionary by the Commission, which must consider "the value of program continuity and planning certainty and the value of allowing competitive opportunities for potentially new administrators," and shall "weigh the benefits of the party's proposed program" and ensure that it meets certain criteria.

[4] Section 381.1(e) and (f) enables a CCA to seek to administer a more restricted pool of funds, excluding funds collected for non-CCA customers and for statewide and regional programs.

[5] June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling in R.09-11-014 at p. 2.

11-014 service list, pursuant to the procedures specified in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling.

NOTICE

Pursuant to the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling, MEA states that it served a copy of its letter to the Director of the Energy Division requesting certification of its plan to the R.09-11-014 service list, the assigned Commissioner, and the assigned ALJ for R.09-11-014.

DISCUSSION

The Section 381.1(a) application option and the Section 381.1 (e) and (f) certification option require different types and levels of Commission review, which are reflected in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling. We find that the resolution process is a reasonable and appropriate procedure for certifying MEA's EE plan submitted pursuant to Section 381.1(f) , while permanent procedures for all CCAs are under consideration for adoption by the Commission in R.09-11-014 or a successor proceeding.

In the absence of formally adopted procedures to address certification requests under Section 381.1(e) and (f), this resolution reviews MEA's election option and certifies MEA's plan without prejudicing any future Commission decision-making on implementing Section 381.1 or SB 790. The Commission's interim process used here meets all of the requirements of Section 381.1 in order to determine funding levels and certify MEA's plan for 2012, as set forth below.

Description of MEA's Plan

MEA's amended plan includes the following elements and schedule for what is described as "Phase 1" (Aug – Dec 2012). The longer term MEA plan, considered "Phase 2," was part of the original February 3, 2012 plan and extends out to March 2015. The post-2012 (Phase 2) program activities are provided in order to place MEA's 2012 (Phase 1) request in context.

Phase I (August 2012 – Dec 2012)

1. Direct Service Element
   - The Multi-Family Energy Efficiency Project

2. Support for Existing Programs
    - Support for Energy Upgrade California (expanded to Multi-Family)
    - Coordination and Outreach with Marin Energy Watch Partnership
3. Financing Element: Pilot On-Bill Repayment for Multi-Family Energy Efficiency Improvements
    - Plan for Property Assessed Clean Energy in 2013
    - Plan for Standard Offer for Energy Efficiency Procurement

Phase 1 Budget: $428,270

Phase 1 Savings: The Multi-Family Energy Efficiency Project is projected to achieve a reduction 719,474 kWh during the initial 5 months of the program. The program is also projected to result in 45 kW of peak demand savings during that period.

Phase II (Jan 2013 – March 2015) – *Informational Only*

1. Additional Direct Service Elements
    - Continuance of Multi-Family Energy Efficiency Program
    - Convenience Store & Small Grocer Energy Efficiency Deployment
    - Restaurant Energy Efficiency Project
2. Support for Existing Programs
    - Support for Energy Upgrade California (expansion to Small Commercial Programs)
    - Coordination and Outreach with Marin Energy Watch Partnership
3. Financing Element:
    - Property Assessed Clean Energy
    - On-Bill Repayment for Energy Efficiency Improvements (expanded to small commercial)
    - Pilot Standard Offer for Energy Efficiency Procurement

Funding Determination

First, it is necessary to establish whether MEA's funding request is within the forecasted maximum amount of funds MEA would be eligible to collect. While the Commission works to formally adopted rules for all CCAs in its pending proceeding, we will use the formula proposed in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling to consider MEA's plan, as follows:

> CCA maximum funding = Total electricity energy efficiency nonbypassable charge collections from the CCA's customers – (total electricity energy efficiency nonbypassable charge collections from the CCA's customers * % of the applicable IOU portfolio budget that was dedicated to statewide and regional programs in the most recently authorized program cycle).

Total EE Collections from MEA Customers

The Commission has determined, via data request submittals to both PG&E and MEA, the actual and forecasted amounts of non-bypassable charges[6] likely to be collected from MEA's customers[7] in 2012 to fund energy efficiency programs (See Appendix A).

Section 381.1(e) speaks only to the source of a CCA's fund ("…funds collected from the aggregator's electric service customers…."), but it is silent as to whether the period of fund collections that a CCA is eligible to receive must be the same as the period in which a CCA plans to spend these funds to administer programs. In MEA's case, MEA stated in its original February 3, 2012 EE plan that they would begin implementing programs in April 2012. MEA's amended plan, filed in June 2012, states that they plan to begin implementing programs as of August 2012.

Notably, the IOUs' collection periods and their energy efficiency funds expenditure periods do not necessarily match – in fact, the IOUs often collect more money than they spend in the early years of an energy efficiency program

[6] For 2012, PG&E has two non-bypassable energy efficiency charges: (1) Procurement Energy Efficiency Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (PEERAM), and (2) Public Purpose Program Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (PPPRAM).

[7] "MEA's customers" are those customers that have not opted-out – or that MEA forecasts will not opt-out – of Marin Clean Energy service in 2012.

cycle, and conversely, often collect less money than they spend in the latter years as energy efficiency program expenditures ramp up.

Given that the law is silent on the matter, we find that it is reasonable to determine the collections period from the date MEA's original plan was first submitted (February 3, 2012) through the end of 2012. We do this because we do not wish to limit the amount of funds MEA is eligible to receive based on the length of time consumed by the Commission's review or regulatory process. The changes in MEA's plan from the original February submittal to the amended June submittal were part of the normal review and revision process that takes place, just as it does for utility filings. Indeed, the MEA plan could be considered an unusual case because (a) SB 790 (Leno, 2011) only recently passed last year, (b) the Commission had yet to establish formal procedures to implement the law, and (c) the Commission had yet to receive budget authorization to hire staff to implement the bill.

Thus, MEA should be eligible to administer funds collected from February 3, 2012 through December 31, 2012. The total amount of EE surcharges forecasted to be collected from MEA's customers during this period is $2,702,520 (See appendix B). As discussed below, some percentage of this amount would be eligible for MEA to collect from PG&E, after subtracting out collections to support statewide and regional programs.

Funding Exclusions

PU Code 381.1 (e) states:

> The impartial process established by the commission shall allow a registered community choice aggregator to elect to become the administrator of funds collected from the aggregator's electric service customers and collected through a nonbypassable charge authorized by the commission, for cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation programs, ***except those funds collected for broader statewide and regional programs authorized by the commission***. (Emphasis added)

In determining which programs were considered "regional" and "statewide" in nature, we find it reasonable to adopt the funding formula and definitions proposed in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling. We emphasize that this approach is interim and subject to change pending to the outcome of the formal proceeding. The definitions provided in that ruling are as follows:

> **"Regional Programs"** - Programs offered to all eligible customers throughout an individual IOU's service territory in which a CCA is offering service, but not necessarily offered in other IOU service territories. This includes state and institutional government partnerships. This does not include any programs that are offered only in a geographic subset of an IOU territory.[8]

> **"Statewide programs"** – Programs, as defined and designated by the Commission, that are offered throughout the four investor-owned utilities (IOUs') service territories on a generally consistent basis. Evaluation, Measurement and Verification budgets are included in statewide programs, as these budgets are overseen by Commission staff across all four IOUs on a consistent basis.[9]

In order to calculate the funding exclusion, the Commission reviewed PG&E's most recently approved 2010 – 2012 portfolio budget, as authorized by D.09-09-047 and modified by PG&E AL 3235-G-A/3901-E-A, effective February 10, 2012, and sorted programs which, according to program rules, met the definitions in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling. Though not specified in the ALJ ruling, we categorize the on-bill financing program as a regional program, for purposes of the CCA funding calculation, because it is offered throughout PG&E's service territory.[10] Thus defined, the statewide and regional program budgets were determined as a percentage of the overall portfolio, and the eligible collections were calculated according to the formula above. Appendix B to this resolution breaks down PG&E's portfolio budgets into relevant funding categories, and calculates the percentage of PG&E's total portfolio budget attributable to

[8] June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling in R.09-11-014 at p. 11.

[9] Ibid.

[10] We note that the on-bill financing was approved as a "local program" as that term is in PG&E's Application 08-07-031, approved as modified in D.09-09-047. But, because the on-bill financing program meets the definition of a regional program as set forth in this resolution, we categorize it as such herein.

statewide and regional programs. Appendix C to this resolution breaks down PG&E's third-party programs into those defined as regional (because their program eligibility rules make no geographical restrictions) and non-regional.

Based on the Commission's review of PG&E's budget for the purposes of calculating funds available to MEA, 85% of PG&E's total portfolio is dedicated to fund statewide and regional programs. Conversely, 15% of PG&E's portfolio budget is the proportion of nonbypassable energy efficiency monies MEA is eligible to utilize in 2012. As such, of the $2,702,520 energy efficiency monies estimated to be collected from MEA's customers during the February-December 2012 time period, $403,744 (15 percent) is the forecasted maximum amount that could be allocated to MEA. We note that this figure ($403,744) is slightly lower than MEA's funding request ($428,270). Actual collections and remittances to MEA may vary depending on actual sales and collections. Therefore, we find MEA's funding request to be within the likely range of eligible collections.

Energy Division determined via data request to PG&E that for the current program cycle (2010 – 2012) there is an anticipated unspent budget of $457,284 from PG&E's Government Partnership program.[11] In addition, PG&E anticipates that the on-bill financing program will have $2,618,518 of unspent budget by the end of the budget cycle. Therefore, PG&E is expected to have funds available to transfer to MEA.

Review of Plan

Pursuant to Section 381.1(f), the Commission must certify that the MEA plan meets six criteria, specified in paragraph (f)(1)-(6) of the statute. Accordingly, we review MEA's plan and make findings on each criteria in the sections below.

1. *Is consistent with the goals of the programs established pursuant to this section [Section 381.1] and Section 399.4.*

Section 381.1 encourages the administration of cost-effective energy efficiency and conservation programs by CCAs and other non-IOU administrators. Section 399.4(a) states that prudent energy efficiency investments should continue to be

[11] PG&E data request response, EEGA 1944 (ED 151)

made in order to "produce cost-effective energy savings, reduce customer demand, and contribute to the safe and reliable operation of the electric distribution grid." Similar to PG&E's energy efficiency programs currently authorized by the Commission to pursue these goals, it is reasonable to expect that MEA's MFEEP program (and any future program activities) will do the same.

Further, Section 399.4(c) states that, in evaluating energy efficiency investments, the Commission shall:

> "ensure that local and regional interests, multifamily dwellings and energy service industry capabilities are incorporated into program portfolio design and that local governments, community-based organizations, and energy efficiency service providers are encouraged to participate in program implementation, where appropriate."

Because MEA's plan includes only one program – the MFEEP – it cannot be characterized as a "portfolio" of programs, and, therefore, many of the requirements of this section are moot. Nevertheless, MEA's plan actively includes the local and regional interests of all the cities within Marin County. By virtue of the fact that MEA is a community-based local government agency, its plan to administer energy efficiency programs for its community is expected to meet the goals of Section 399.4(c). MEA's plan states that they will capitalize on the efforts of the Marin City Community Development Agency, Marin Energy Management Team, Marin Energy Watch PG&E Partnership, Sonoma County Energy Independence Program, Marin Employment Connection, and the Marin Workforce Investment Board, among others. The plan also promotes multi-family strategies and targets outreach to implementation contractors in the multifamily market.[12]

Therefore, we find that MEA's plan meets the Section 381.1(f)(1) criteria.

2. *Advances the public interest in maximizing cost-effective electricity savings and related benefits*

[12] MEA plan at p. 12.

MEA states that it performed a cost-effectiveness analysis consistent with the Standard Practice Manual and the most currently published E3 calculator and Database on Energy Efficiency Resources (DEER).[13] These are Commission-approved methods and tools for assessing cost-effectiveness. MEA provides detailed results of the cost-effectiveness analysis in Appendix B of their plan. The multi-family program has a Total Resource Cost (TRC) result of 0.82 and a Program Administrator Cost (PAC) result of 1.73, when including the administrative costs of hiring one full-time Energy Efficiency Program Coordinator staff position.[14]

MEA justifies the cost-effectiveness of its plan, even though the TRC is less than 1.0, because they expect the TRC to improve over time, as they provide additional program services (beyond the multi-family program) in 2013 and beyond, and that this will increase benefits relative to costs. MEA also argues that, because the multi-family program passes the PAC test, it is cost-effective in 2012.

Section 381.1(f)(2) requires this Commission to make a finding as to whether MEA's plan "advances the public interest in maximizing cost-effective electricity savings and related benefits," in order to certify (or not) the plan on the basis of whether that condition is met. It is reasonable and appropriate to make this determination by referring to current Commission rules and policies governing energy efficiency cost-effectiveness. As stated in the Energy Efficiency Policy Manual: "This Commission relies on the TRC as the primary indicator of energy efficiency program cost effectiveness, consistent with our view that ratepayer-funded energy efficiency should focus on programs that serve as resource alternatives to supply-side options." Therefore, the fact that MEA's plan does

---

[13] Ibid at p. 10.

[14] Due to an apparent typographical error, there is an inconsistency on page 12 of MEA's plan which states that the multi-family program, including the one full-time MEA staffing position, has TRC = 0.91 and PAC = 2.15. The results in Appendix B of MEA's plan correspond to TRC=0.82 and PAC=1.73 and also correspond to the total requested funding amount, $428, 270. Therefore, we presume the values on page 12 are erroneous.

not pass the TRC test is a concern. We cannot certify MEA's plan based on their argument that the PAC test, alone, should be sufficient.

However, the Commission must also take into consideration whether the plan "advances the public interest," not only in maximizing cost-effective electricity savings, but also "related benefits." MEA's plan seeks initial seed funding to establish a program, which, if it succeeds, will advance the public interest. A challenge which MEA (or any CCA seeking to become a program administrator) must overcome is the expenditure of dollars and time it takes to launch its operations as a program administrator, without yet having the resources (and expertise) to fulfill the endeavor. MEA's plan seeks to hire a full-time staff person to develop and refine program designs, participate in CPUC proceedings, and prepare regulatory filings. To the extent that the investment in these "start-up" activities leads to benefits down the road, this is in the public interest.

Further, MEA's plan should be evaluated on the "related benefits" it provides. Among the related benefits, MEA's plan aims to provide participant recruitment, community-based outreach and communications, and workforce development and job creation. The Commission recognized in D.09-09-047 and D.12-05-015 that local governments may, in some cases, be more capable than the IOUs in reaching potential program participants, and increasing uptake of energy efficiency, through local events, communication channels, and strategies catered to their communities. The fact that MEA's plan chooses to initially focus on multi-family dwellings, a "hard-to-reach" market and a goal of Section 399.4, is another related benefit. Finally, compared to PG&E's Multi-family Energy Efficiency Rebate (MFEER) program which has a projected TRC of 0.89,[15] MEA's multi-family program appears, at least, comparable to the PG&E alternative.

In sum, we find that, under the following particular circumstances of MEA's 2012 plan, it is reasonable to certify that the Section 381.1(f)(2) criteria has been met:

- First, by giving CCAs the option to "elect to become" energy efficiency program administrators, Sections 381.1(e) and (f) appear intended to give

[15] As per Energy Division analysis of PG&E reported program savings and costs through December 2011. These PG&E reported values are subject to verification and evaluation.

CCAs more flexibility to seek program administrator status before the Commission, than would otherwise be the case for "any party" applying for the same under Section 381.1(a) provisions.

- Second, the Commission has yet to adopt permanent policies and procedures governing implementation of Section 381.1(a) and (f). As set forth in the June 20, 2012 ALJ ruling in R.09-11-014 (and relatedly, in Phase 2 of that proceeding), the Commission contemplates addressing these matters in a formal proceeding. But, until such time, our informal rulings on this matter will be provisional and interim.

We caveat, however, that these findings pertain to MEA's 2012 plan only. Any potential future MEA program plans should find ways to maximize cost-effectiveness, and at minimum, exceed a TRC of 1.0, consistent with Commission policy.

3. *Accommodates the need for broader statewide and regional programs*

MEA's plan describes an intention to accommodate PG&E's Statewide Multifamily Energy Efficiency Rebate (MFEER) program by developing marketing and branding strategies to minimize customer confusion and distinguish between the two programs.[16] MEA also describes an intention to collect data through its evaluation activities to determine if any MEA customers participate in both PG&E's and MEA's multi-family programs.

In the forthcoming 2013-2014 IOU energy efficiency budget application proceeding, we expect the Commission to consider the interactions, and related policy implications, among statewide and regional program activities funded by IOU ratepayers and other CCA-administered programs. While these issues are pending before the Commission, we find the steps MEA states it will take to accommodate statewide and regional programs to be reasonable. Accordingly, we find that MEA's plan meets the Section 381.1(f)(3) criteria.

4. *Includes audit and reporting requirements consistent with the audit and reporting requirements established by the Commission pursuant to Section 381.1.*

---

[16] Ibid at p. 12.

MEA's plan describes its intent to utilize an existing third party to include the MFEEP in its already existing audit and reporting requirements for financial statements and existing generation-side audits. MEA will also submit monthly and annual status reports detailing energy efficiency performance to its Board of Directors. Report categories include customer inquiries, applications, customer audits, contracts, projects, measures, energy/GHG reductions, funding, jobs created, and budget. MEA will provide copies of all reports to Energy Division.

Accordingly, we find that MEA's plan meets the Section 381.1(f)(4) criteria.

5. *Includes evaluation, measurement, and verification (EM&V) protocols established by the CCA.*

MEA's plan describes its intent to utilize the International Performance Measurements and Verification Protocols (IPMVP) when evaluating the MFEEP. These protocols fall into four categories; 1) partially measured retrofit isolation, 2) retrofit isolation, 3) whole building, and 4) calibrated simulation (p. 31 – 32). These protocols are recognized industry standards. MEA proposes a 5th protocol called "Entirely Stipulated Savings." This protocol is not part of the industry recognized IPMVP and is reserved for instances when measurement and verification of savings is not warranted such as "when the cost of measurement is too high when compared to savings, where parameters preclude accurate measurements, or where the confidence of savings projections are high." MEA and their evaluator will utilize this protocol in certain cases without any measurement or verification of savings, if warranted.

As Section 381.1(f)(5) defers to the CCA to establish its own EM&V protocols, the Commission's role is limited to certifying that they have been included in the plan, which they have. Therefore, this criterion is met.

6. *Includes performance metrics regarding the CCA's achievement of the objectives listed in paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, and in any previous plan."*

MEA's plan identifies the following items as performance metrics:

(1) Consistency with statutory goals
- Tracking hard to reach customers
- Progress towards zero net energy in multifamily

- Program energy performance reporting

(2) Cost-effectiveness calculations including Total Resource Costs (TRC) and Program Administrator Costs (PAC)
(3) Tracking of customers participating in both PG&E MFEER and MEA MFEEP programs
(4) MFEEP percentage of non-lighting measure savings as compared to total EE measures adopted in the MFEEP
(5) Evaluation, measurement, and verification process and tracking

MEA's list suggests it has at least one metric for each of the five objectives listed in paragraphs (1) to (5) of Section 381.1(f). However, some of the metrics are vague, as currently worded, and could be improved by identifying the unit of measurement that will be used to determine them. For example, "Tracking of customers participating in both PG&E MFEER and MEA MFEEP" could be reworded to say "*Number* of customers participating in both PG&E MFEER and MEA MFEEP."

While these subtle changes do not lead us to deny MEA's request for certification of its plan, we recognize that improvements could be made.

MEA's 2012 Plan is Certified as Specified Herein

According to the foregoing analysis and discussion, the Commission finds that MEA's 2012 plan satisfactorily meets the required criteria under Section 381.1(f)(1)-(6), and we hereby certify the plan.
PG&E shall make remittances to MEA as follows:

> **February – July 2012:** By no later than August 13, 2012, PG&E is directed to make a lump-sum payment to MEA, based on actual collections (not forecast sales) received from MEA customers.
>
> **August, September, October, November, and December 2012:** PG&E is directed to make remittances to MEA based on actual collections from MEA customers during these months, by the seventh work-day following the end of the previous month. The remittance schedule will, therefore, occur as follows:
>
> - For August EE collections: September 11, 2012

- For September EE collections: October 9, 2012
- For October EE collections: November 9, 2012
- For November EE collections: December 11, 2012
- For December EE collections: January 9, 2013

COMMENTS

Public Utilities Code section 311(g)(1) provides that this resolution must be served on all parties and subject to at least 30 days public review and comment prior to a vote of the Commission. Section 311(g)(2) provides that this 30-day period may be reduced or waived upon the stipulation of all parties in the proceeding.

The 30-day comment period for the draft of this resolution was neither waived nor reduced. Accordingly, this draft resolution was served on MEA, PG&E, and the R.09-11-014 service list and issued for public review and comment no later than 30 days prior to a vote of the Commission.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

1. Until the Commission adopts permanent procedures for all CCAs to elect to become energy efficiency program administrators, it is reasonable, on an interim basis, to certify MEA's request for certification of Community Choice Aggregator energy efficiency program administration plans by the Commission's resolution process so that that MEA can exercise its election right under Section 381.1.

2. Marin Energy Authority's amended 2012 energy efficiency program plan seeks to administer $428,270 in funds collected by Pacific Gas & Electric from Marin Energy Authority customers through nonbypassable charges (specifically, the Procurement Energy Efficiency Revenue Adjustment Mechanism and the Public Purpose Program Revenue Adjustment Mechanism) authorized by the Commission to administer energy efficiency programs.

3. Public Utilities Code Sections 381.1(e) and (f) do not: prescribe the method of calculating the funding levels; the method of determining cost-

effectiveness; define "cost-effective energy efficiency electricity savings and related benefits"; or define "regional programs."

4. The Commission should exercise its discretionary authority to certify Community Choice Aggregators' energy efficiency plans when evaluating those plans in the absence of clear statutory directives.

5. The June 20, 2012 Administrative Law Judge's ruling in R.09-11-014 proposed a methodology and definition of terms to determine the maximum amount of eligible funding Community Choice Aggregators may elect to administer.

6. Until the Commission adopts permanent procedures, it is reasonable, on an interim basis, to interpret undefined terms in Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(e), as proposed in the June 20, 2012 Administrative Law Judge's ruling in R.09-11-014, and as specified herein.

7. It is reasonable to calculate the maximum amount of 2012 funds Marin Energy Authority would be eligible to collect and utilize pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(e), according to the method specified herein and further elaborated in Appendices A, B, and C of this resolution.

8. A reasonable forecast of the maximum amount of funds Marin Energy Authority would be eligible to collect for administration of 2012 energy efficiency programs is $403,744, pursuant to the definitions and methodologies specified herein.

9. Marin Energy Authority's requested funding amount falls within the range of likely collections Pacific Gas & Electric will make from Marin Energy Authority customers in 2012.

10. Pacific Gas & Electric is projected to have sufficient unspent 2010-2012 funds, including but not limited to, $457,284 in the "government programs" category, which could be transferred to Marin Energy Authority.

11. It is reasonable and appropriate to make determinations under Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(f)(2) by referring to current Commission rules and policies governing energy efficiency cost-effectiveness.

12. Marin Energy Authority's 2012 energy efficiency program administration plan includes the components required by Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(f) and meets the criteria given in Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(f)(1)-(6), as discussed herein.

13. Nothing in this resolution is intended to establish a precedent for how any other requests to administer energy efficiency funds should be reviewed. The rules that apply to community choice aggregators are contained in Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(e) and (f), and are different than those that apply to other kinds of entities. Furthermore, the Commission is considering in R.09-11-014 how requests from community choice aggregators under 381.1(e) and (f) should be reviewed. Because of the need to process MEA's request before those procedures have been established, the review process here is necessarily an interim one.

ORDERING PARAGRAPHS:

1. Marin Energy Authority's 2012 energy efficiency program administration plan, as amended on June 22, 2012, is certified pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 381.1(f).

2. No later than 30 days from the date of this resolution, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) shall transfer to the Marin Energy Authority (MEA) fifteen percent of all monies collected through nonbypassable charges (specifically, the Procurement Energy Efficiency Revenue Adjustment Mechanism and the Public Purpose Program Revenue Adjustment Mechanism) from MEA retail electricity customers from February 3, 2012 through July 31, 2012. Beginning no later than 60 days from the date of this resolution, and every month thereafter, PG&E shall transfer to MEA fifteen percent of all monies collected through nonbypassable charges (the Procurement Energy Efficiency Revenue Adjustment Mechanism and the Public Purpose Program Revenue Adjustment Mechanism) from MEA retail electricity customers during the prior calendar month. The total amount transferred from PG&E to MEA shall not to exceed $428,270, the funding requested in Marin Energy Authority's plan to utilize eligible collections from MEA electricity customers in 2012.

3. PG&E is authorized to and shall transfer these funds from the "governmental programs" category of its 2010-2012 program funding, pursuant to D.09-09-047 and fund-shifting rules clarified in the December 22, 2011 Assigned Commissioner's Ruling in Rulemaking 09-11-014. If, after transferring funds, insufficient funds remain in the "governmental programs" category, PG&E shall transfer remaining funds from the on-bill financing program in the "other programs" fund-shifting category.

This Resolution is effective today.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed and adopted at a conference of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California held on August 2, 2012, the following Commissioners voting favorably thereon:

PAUL CLANON
Executive Director

Appendix A
Forecasted Total Energy Efficiency Collections from MEA Customers

The monthly dollar figures contained in "Table 1a", broken out by customer class, were obtained by multiplying the associated usage (KWh) totals in "Table 1b" by the $/ KWh totals in "Table 1c".

Table 1a		Usage x Rates = amounts collected by customer class (feb - dec: 2012)											
Class/Schedule	january	february	march	april	may	june	july	august	september	october	november	december	Totals
E-1		$ 53,390.92	$ 51,149.77	$ 47,341.63	$ 42,648.05	$ 47,399.28	$ 140,197.65	$ 142,989.77	$ 145,051.64	$ 144,032.28	$ 168,020.49	$ 188,593.27	$ 1,170,814.74
EL-1		$ 1,989.96	$ 1,967.01	$ 1,849.72	$ 1,558.49	$ 1,732.12	$ 18,645.28	$ 19,027.83	$ 19,405.68	$ 19,334.86	$ 24,078.43	$ 26,939.35	$ 136,528.74
E-7		$ 3,700.29	$ 3,723.24	$ 3,178.61	$ 2,518.69	$ 2,799.28	$ 7,625.04	$ 8,014.20	$ 8,442.43	$ 9,289.30	$ 11,580.35	$ 14,000.93	$ 74,872.35
E-8		$ 3,028.11	$ 2,929.28	$ 2,653.06	$ 2,441.17	$ 2,713.13	$ 5,951.50	$ 6,080.54	$ 6,066.61	$ 6,041.38	$ 6,803.58	$ 7,634.50	$ 52,342.85
EL-8		$ 298.15	$ 304.19	$ 262.92	$ 237.55	$ 264.02	$ 549.46	$ 525.83	$ 538.14	$ 523.50	$ 682.08	$ 826.11	$ 5,011.96
A-1		$ 2,863.71	$ 3,139.25	$ 3,690.94	$ 2,783.45	$ 3,093.54	$ 48,752.30	$ 49,473.70	$ 50,369.42	$ 47,692.06	$ 49,478.03	$ 49,964.81	$ 311,301.21
A-6		$ 2,984.28	$ 2,884.59	$ 2,854.44	$ 2,331.94	$ 2,591.74	$ 11,626.89	$ 11,593.94	$ 12,209.87	$ 11,705.31	$ 11,544.58	$ 11,972.18	$ 84,299.76
A-15		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TC-1		$ 142.78	$ 142.62	$ 140.44	$ 137.97	$ 153.34	$ 219.99	$ 230.65	$ 227.93	$ 222.36	$ 237.79	$ 235.51	$ 2,091.37
A-10T		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
A-10P		$ 135.85	$ 89.12	$ 66.69	$ 42.39	$ 47.12	$ 247.47	$ 275.62	$ 298.87	$ 293.77	$ 301.95	$ 190.32	$ 1,989.18
A-10S		$ 28,527.15	$ 27,915.74	$ 26,357.65	$ 26,205.98	$ 29,125.47	$ 48,146.32	$ 49,147.37	$ 51,156.91	$ 48,133.52	$ 47,635.92	$ 46,197.76	$ 428,549.79
E-19T		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
E-19P		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,849.86	$ 2,784.71	$ 3,141.07	$ 3,095.85	$ 3,987.68	$ 4,200.29	$ 20,059.46
E-19S		$ 2,232.41	$ 2,380.47	$ 2,322.03	$ 2,486.83	$ 2,763.88	$ 37,831.63	$ 37,687.33	$ 38,211.07	$ 35,799.84	$ 36,482.30	$ 35,193.72	$ 233,391.50
LS-1, LS-2, LS-3		$ 1,582.59	$ 1,638.06	$ 1,676.37	$ 1,634.90	$ 1,817.04	$ 2,368.02	$ 2,241.77	$ 2,274.20	$ 2,270.57	$ 2,243.41	$ 2,255.56	$ 22,002.49
OL-1		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 35.12	$ 34.39	$ 34.38	$ 33.69	$ 35.71	$ 34.87	$ 208.15
Standby T		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Standby P		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Standby S		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-1A		$ 9.51	$ 8.39	$ 6.75	$ 6.72	$ 7.47	$ 290.75	$ 257.96	$ 243.07	$ 242.98	$ 276.82	$ 299.41	$ 1,649.83
AG-RA		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-VA		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-4A		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 151.84	$ 112.55	$ 128.06	$ 133.67	$ 132.86	$ 121.53	$ 780.51
AG-5A		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 562.70	$ 498.25	$ 560.37	$ 478.90	$ 479.59	$ 502.03	$ 3,081.84
AG-1B		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 272.61	$ 492.05	$ 182.91	$ 256.12	$ 161.36	$ 195.47	$ 1,560.52
AG-RB		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-VB		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-4B		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 18.30	$ 0.75	$ 1.56	$ 0.87	$ 0.64	$ 0.67	$ 22.78
AG-4C		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
AG-5B		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 512.75	$ 483.13	$ 615.04	$ 526.34	$ 598.02	$ 562.19	$ 3,297.46
AG-5C		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 261.29	$ 357.90	$ 324.07	$ 179.77	$ 31.39	$ 12.23	$ 1,166.64
E-20T		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
E-20P		$ 1,953.13	$ 2,075.79	$ 1,913.97	$ 2,193.13	$ 2,437.46	$ 14,160.53	$ 14,180.52	$ 14,194.01	$ 14,037.06	$ 12,686.65	$ 11,933.97	$ 91,766.22
E-20S		$ 1,424.44	$ 1,279.13	$ 1,142.59	$ 2,072.52	$ 2,303.41	$ 9,543.07	$ 9,885.35	$ 8,897.69	$ 6,968.83	$ 6,729.09	$ 5,485.03	$ 55,731.16
													$ 2,702,520.52

Table 1b		Usage (KWh)										
Class/Schedule	january	february	march	april	may	june	july	august	september	october	november	december
E-1		11,432,744	10,952,841	10,137,394	9,132,344	10,149,739	30,020,910	30,618,794	31,060,309	30,842,029	35,978,692	40,383,998
EL-1		426,115	421,202	396,086	333,724	370,903	3,992,565	4,074,482	4,155,393	4,140,228	5,155,981	5,768,597
E-7		787,295	792,179	676,299	535,891	595,592	1,622,348	1,705,149	1,796,261	1,976,447	2,463,904	2,978,922
E-8		576,783	557,958	505,345	464,985	516,787	1,133,618	1,158,198	1,155,545	1,150,738	1,295,920	1,454,190
EL-8		56,791	57,940	50,080	45,248	50,289	104,659	100,159	102,503	99,715	129,920	157,355
A-1		560,414	614,335	722,296	544,706	605,389	9,540,568	9,681,743	9,857,030	9,333,084	9,682,589	9,777,848
A-6		682,901	660,089	653,191	533,626	593,075	2,660,615	2,653,076	2,794,022	2,678,561	2,641,780	2,739,629
A-15		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TC-1		28,670	28,638	28,200	27,705	30,791	44,174	46,316	45,769	44,650	47,749	47,292
A-10T		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A-10P		31,890	20,921	15,656	9,952	11,060	58,092	64,700	70,158	68,959	70,881	44,676
A-10S		6,498,212	6,358,937	6,004,020	5,969,471	6,634,504	10,967,271	11,195,300	11,653,056	10,964,355	10,851,006	10,523,408
E-19T		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E-19P		-	-	-	-	-	768,156	750,595	846,650	834,462	1,074,845	1,132,154
E-19S		545,821	582,023	567,733	608,028	675,766	9,249,787	9,214,505	9,342,559	8,753,017	8,919,877	8,604,822
LS-1, LS-2, LS-3		314,631	325,659	333,275	325,030	361,240	470,778	445,680	452,128	451,405	446,005	448,421
OL-1		-	-	-	-	-	7,123	6,976	6,973	6,834	7,243	7,073
Standby T		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Standby P		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Standby S		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-1A		1,243	1,097	882	879	977	38,006	33,720	31,774	31,762	36,186	39,139
AG-RA		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-VA		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-4A		-	-	-	-	-	26,827	19,885	22,626	23,617	23,473	21,471
AG-5A		-	-	-	-	-	117,967	104,454	117,479	100,398	100,542	105,248
AG-1B		-	-	-	-	-	47,002	84,835	31,536	44,159	27,821	33,702
AG-RB		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-VB		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-4B		-	-	-	-	-	3,719	152	316	177	131	136
AG-4C		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AG-5B		-	-	-	-	-	142,430	134,202	170,843	146,205	166,116	156,165
AG-5C		-	-	-	-	-	74,869	102,550	92,856	51,509	8,994	3,504
E-20T		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E-20P		548,632	583,087	537,633	616,047	684,679	3,977,678	3,983,292	3,987,081	3,942,996	3,563,666	3,352,237
E-20S		358,800	322,199	287,806	522,046	580,205	2,403,797	2,490,012	2,241,233	1,755,373	1,694,984	1,381,621

Table 1c		$/KWh Rates = Proc EE + PPPRAM EE										
Class/Schedule	**january**	**february**	**march**	**april**	**may**	**june**	**july**	**august**	**september**	**october**	**november**	**december**
E-1		$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670
EL-1		$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670	$0.004670
E-7		$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700	$0.004700
E-8		$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250
EL-8		$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250	$0.005250
A-1		$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110
A-6		$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370	$0.004370
A-15		$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110	$0.005110
TC-1		$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980	$0.004980
A-10T		$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050	$0.004050
A-10P		$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260	$0.004260
A-10S		$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390	$0.004390
E-19T		$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690	$0.003690
E-19P		$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710
E-19S		$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090	$0.004090
LS-1, LS-2, LS-3		$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030	$0.005030
OL-1		$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930	$0.004930
Standby T		$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710	$0.003710
Standby P		$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990	$0.005990
Standby S		$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580	$0.005580
AG-1A		$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650	$0.007650
AG-RA		$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680	$0.005680
AG-VA		$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690	$0.005690
AG-4A		$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660	$0.005660
AG-5A		$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770	$0.004770
AG-1B		$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800	$0.005800
AG-RB		$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190	$0.005190
AG-VB		$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130	$0.005130
AG-4B		$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920	$0.004920
AG-4C		$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960	$0.004960
AG-5B		$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600	$0.003600
AG-5C		$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490	$0.003490
E-20T		$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870	$0.002870
E-20P		$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560	$0.003560
E-20S		$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970	$0.003970

[End Appendix A]

Appendix B
PG&E Total Portfolio Breakdown by Funding Category

Table 2. PG&E Total Portfolio Budget Breakdown by Funding Category

*Most recently authorized budgets per D.09-009-047, as modified by PG&E AL 3235-G-A/3901-E-A, effective February 10, 2012

Program Category	Budget Excluded*	Budget Included*
Statewide (a)	$733,733,309	$0
EM&V	$53,520,000	$0
3P - No Geographic restrictions (b)	$265,344,556	$0
3P – Geographic restrictions (c)	$0	$55,440,887
LGP (d)	$0	$110,530,649
LG Institutional (e)	$57,666,146	$0
Local programs (except OBF) (f)	$0	$35,239,355
OBF (g)	$27,844,983	$0
Total by Category	$1,138,108,994	$201,210,891
Total Portfolio		$1,338,000,000
% Included		**15%**
% Excluded		85%

(a) - Programs approved by the Commission as "statewide" among all the IOUs.
(b) - Third-party programs offered with no geographical restrictions throughout PG&E's service territory.
(c) - Third party programs that are geographically limited (per program rules) within PG&E's service territory.
(d) - Local Government Partnerships. These are restricted to local areas.
(e) - Government partnerships available throughout PG&E's service territory.
(f) - All programs proposed as "local" programs by PG&E in A.08-07-031, and approved in D.09-09-047, except on-bill financing.
(g) - On-bill financing, a program which is offered to qualifying non-residential customers throughout PG&E's service territory
(h) - The numbers on this line do not add up to PG&E's total approved portfolio budget of $1,338,000,000. This error represents less than 1% (0.10%) and has negligible impact on the percentage figure used to calculate MEA's eligible 2012 funding amount.

MEA Collection Period	MEA Customer Collections ($)	$ of Porfolio Available for MEA Funding	$ of Portfolio Excluded From Funding Availability	% of Portfolio Available for Funding	$ Available Based on MEA Collections
Feb - Dec	$2,702,521	$201,210,891	$1,138,108,994	15%	**$403,744**

Appendix C
PG&E Third-Party Program Budget Breakdown for "Regional" Programs

Table 3a. PG&E Third-Party Program Budgets Categorized as "Regional" Programs (Excluded from MEA Funding Calcuation)

*Most recently authorized budgets per D.09-009-047, as modified by PG&E AL 3235-G-A/3901-E-A, effective February 10, 2012

Program ID#	Program Name	Budget*
PGE2176	California Multifamily New Homes Program	$8,386,261
PGE2234	Comprehensive Food Processing Audit & Resource Efficiency	6,157,516
PGE2235	Dairy Industry Resource Advantage	$1,789,381
PGE2178	Energy Star Manufactured Homes	$1,175,638
PGE2236	Process Wastewater Treatment and Energy Management for Ag & Food Processing	$2,251,070
PGE2189	Cool Control Plus	$6,259,382
PGE2210	Cool Schools	$1,045,829
PGE2222	EE Services for Oil Production	$20,440,750
PGE2223	Heavy Industry EE Program	36,873,179
PGE2225	Refinery EE Program	$19,079,203
PGE2227	Cement Production and Distribution EE	$1,660,134
PGE2233	Wine Industry Efficiency Solutions	$8,550,811
PGE2181	AirCarePlus	$20,593,564
PGE2182	Commercial / Industrial Boilers EE	$8,150,527
PGE2185	Energy Smart Grocer	$17,686,937
PGE2186	Enhanced Automation Initiative	$1,864,992
PGE2187	Monitoring-Based Persistence Commissioning	$3,795,579
PGE2190	Lodging Savers	$11,250,838
PGE2191	Medical Bldg Tune-Up	$2,201,773
PGE2193	School EE Program	$9,401,258
PGE2198	Data Center Cooling Controls Prog	$1,804,422
PGE2199	EE Parking Garage	$2,190,696
PGE2200	Furniture Store EE	$3,492,764
PGE2201	High Performance Office Lighting	$6,024,668
PGE2202	LED Accelerator	$3,827,740
PGE2203	Monitoring-Based Commissioning	$1,827,769
PGE2204	GreenVent for EE Kitchens	$5,109,511
PGE2206	Healthcare EE Program	$6,719,136
PGE2209	Ozone Laundry EE	$1,894,224
PGE2212	California Preschool EE Program	$2,428,790
PGE2213	K-12 Private Schools and Colleges Audit Retro	$2,725,590
PGE2214	Matrix Energy Services	$2,101,984
PGE2220	Assessment, Implementation, and Monitoring of compressed aire systems	$4,346,993
PGE2221	CA Wastewater Process Optimization Program	$3,918,513
PGE2183	Comprehensive Retail Energy Mngmt	$1,931,159
PGE2224	Ecos Air Industrial Compressed Air	$6,828,262
PGE2228	Industrial Retrocommission	$5,373,211
PGE2230	Dairy EE Program	$1,459,273
PGE2231	Industrial Refridgeration Perf Plus	$4,562,387
PGE2240	Builder Energy Code Training	$1,671,925
PGE2241	Green Building Technical Support Service	$1,991,104
PGE2205	Casino Green / Tribal Properties	$4,499,813
	Total	**$265,344,556**

Table 3b. PG&E Third-Party Program Budgets not Categorized as "Regional" Programs (Included in MEA Funding Calcuation)		
Program ID#	**Program Name**	**Budget***
PGE2179	Direct Install for Manufactured and Mobile	$4,963,183
PGE2196	RightLights	$20,187,107
PGE2194	Energy Fitness Program	$9,508,003
PGE2197	Small Commercial Comprehensive Program	$10,142,792
PGE2177	Cooling Optimizer / Enhanced Time Delay	$1,996,749
PGE2242	Cool Cash	$1,287,094
PGE2195	Energy Savers Program	$4,159,026
PGE2232	Mercury Vapor Yard Light Exchange Program	$3,196,933
	Total	**$55,440,887**

[End of Appendix C]